HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 12 Saturday, March 23, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Capital Roundup: A round of dinner parties and cocktail gatherings in the most exciting capital in the world this week yields the following (which, even when properly evaluated, can curl the hair of any veteran Washington observer):

(1) One Republican legislator (a member of the select Congressional group which confers with the President every week) remarked: "This grass-roots demand for cutting the Budget can blow up the Eisenhower Administration unless the White House gets busy and helps cut like a meat-ax."

Another GOP member of Congress remarked with a knowing nod: "It's in the works. The Palace Guard is scared of a popular explosion and will yield on a compromise cut of $3 billion. That's just the danger — we could cut $8 billion and have a tax reduction, but the boys at '1600' count on a compromise to hold down and allay popular sentiment until the Congress adjourns."

(2) A Southern Democratic wheel horse — who does not drink — said with sober solemnity, "If there isn't a really big cut in spending, there are going to be tax strikes all over the country. Poujade? Well, something like what happened in France."

(3) What's Nixon bringing home from that African trip? According to those who see "Eyes Only" material, he has made the following commitments (which will swell the widely detested foreign-aid bill): promises of economic aid to five areas — Libya, Ethiopia, Sudan, Gaza and Morocco. How much? Gross about $100 million, partly in goods and technical assistance, partly in cash (most of the cash to the Sultan of Morocco).

(4) That controversial Presidential helicopter — billed as a vehicle to take the Great White Father from the White House to the National Airport and back — actually is designed for something quite startlingly different. It would, it is explained, take the President away from Washington in case of a *real* air raid alert and convey him to the "secret White House" in the country north of the Capital. Under such circumstances, panic and traffic congestion might prevent the President from reaching National Airport by auto. Why, then, did the Ike aides risk public criticism for wasting funds? Stupidity — for they could have got a small item like a helicopter into Army appropriations without notice.

(5) Stassen touches bottom — nobody wants to be seen talking to him, even at a cocktail party. At the Norwegian Ambassador's (he's dean of the diplomatic corps) reception last week, Christian Herter (now Under Secretary of State) was noticed noticing Stassen entering the room. Childe Harold, impeded by the crowd, sought to move towards Herter. The latter turned his face, nervously moved away. This act went on for over 20 minutes, until Herter was able to say goodbye to the hosts and slip out — without shaking hands with Harold.

(6) "Modern Republican" has become a "dirty word," literally, in Washington. Republican speechwriters have got the hint, from on high, not to use the term, which Congressmen and the rank and file of the party will not tolerate. Even "modern Republican" Senator Aiken (Vt.) has turned against it, and urged Republicans not to use it.

Strategy of Probes: The tremendous public interest in the muckraking of the Teamsters Union has caused widespread consternation — successfully concealed from the public to date — among Democrats on Capitol Hill. From several Democrat "liberals" in the Senate, however, HUMAN EVENTS was able to get a picture of Democratic disarray. The Democratic Party in the North — remarked one of these "liberals" — depends to a very great extent on labor organizations to get out the vote in industrial and urban areas.

Some 15,000 organization units — he said — created and run by labor unions, execute this task. What would happen if popular sentiment arising from the current revelations about Hoffa and others should lead to more severe restrictions on the political role of labor? Add to this the loss of prestige by the labor bosses themselves, the accompanying loss of morale among members and revolts of the latter against discipline from above — and you can foresee a true catastrophe for Labor as a political force. And that — these Senators sorrowfully confessed — could lead to the downfall of the traditional Democratic hegemony in the urban

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

areas. The attitude of these Democrats was that the probe had gone too far now to be stopped; the only strategy Democratic heads can now follow is to sit and await the deluge.

Meanwhile, there circulates some worried talk about the liabilities which the GOP incurred by its friendly relations with the Teamsters Union. This today rates as a very sore topic among Republicans.

The worry rests on more than mere conversation. HUMAN EVENTS obtained the following authoritative account from Representative Wint Smith (R.-Kan.) who in 1953 was chairman of a House Labor Subcommittee. It was that GOP-led group, not the Democrats, which first turned up substantial evidence of the malpractices of Teamster heads.

Smith and his group found much damning evidence in Kansas City and Detroit. In the latter city, Representative Smith was approached by various persons, claiming to be friends of the Republican party, who urged him to drop the probe because it might adversely affect the support which the Teamsters Union presumably would give the GOP in the 1954 elections. Smith refused and applied to the head of the full House Labor Committee, to carry on further investigations of the Teamsters in Minneapolis and St. Louis. He supported his plea with strong pieces of evidence which would normally win the go-ahead signal for a Subcommittee Chairman.

But to the surprise — and mystification — of Congressmen, the head of the full Labor Committee refused to authorize such an extension of the probe. The head of the committee (at that time the GOP controlled the House) was Republican wheel horse Sam McConnell of Pennsylvania. In the cloakroom, the obvious conclusion was drawn that the White House, moved by political prudence, asked McConnell to chloroform further embarrassing inquiries into the affairs of the Teamsters.

That is past history. But from it emerges a lesson — as conservative Republicans ponder the public impact of the scabrous details of *l'affaire* Beck. The lesson is that Secretary of Labor Mitchell and the Palace Guard have been unforgivably wrong in trying to deal with the labor bosses; and that the followers of Senator Taft have been right. For the latter point out that Taft pursued a policy of appealing to the rank and file of labor over the heads of their union bosses — and with conspicuous political success. The record of White House friendship with Hoffa and Beck is not one of success.

Inside the McClellan Committee: Senator McClellan emerges from the klieg lights as one of the outstanding political leaders on the national scene. Those who watch the show in the committee room say he grows day by day.

Not so much can be said for his counsel, Robert Kennedy (brother of the Senator from Massachusetts). Veteran members of the press remark that young Kennedy just isn't of the same high caliber as other committee counsels on the Hill — such as Robert Morris (of Senate Internal Security), Richard Arens (of House Un-American Activities) and Jay Sourwine, aide of the late Senator McCarran. Kennedy is scored as weak and inexperienced in his cross-examination. Often, McClellan has to take the ball away from him and finish up a point decisively.

In the corridors, some astonishment was shown at the way the trapping and arrest of Boss Hoffa was "covered up." Naturally, some secrecy had to be maintained in this "cops and robbers" incident, but — it is asked — why did not McClellan and Kennedy give some advance warning to other members of the committee? Certainly the Republican Senators on the committee would have kept the secret. In any case, a bitter seed of partisan feeling has been planted, which may develop into political division within the committee. For a question — highly surcharged with political implications — is being increasingly asked, particularly by Republicans: when will this committee get into the activities of the CIO unions, dear to the heart of Democratic "liberals"?

Committee member Senator Joe McCarthy this week suggested that the committee would strike rich pay dirt. His suggestion at least serves the purpose of reminding the committee staff that this is a field which should be searched. McClellan is known to desire this, but it is not so sure that Senator Kennedy, with his "liberal" political associations, will show a "profile of courage" and support it; no encouragement is expected from Senator McNamara, in view of his relations with the boys in the back room in Detroit.

'Liberals' Next? With its Portland inquiry buttoned up save for a few loose ends, the McClellan Committee plans next to turn its limelight on New York City. It will be a test of whether the Committee will muckrake "liberal" unions.

A sample of what it could uncover appears this week with the indictment for conspiracy and extortion of one Sam Berger, for 12 years "manager" of local 102 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, a famous "liberal" union. He resigned the post last month after taking the Fifth Amendment in testifying before the grand jury which now has indicted him.

Local 102 covers truck drivers in the garment industry. U.S. Attorney Paul Williams says the indictment was based on payment to Berger and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two other union officers of $500 each, per year, by a small non-union garment-making firm, to buy labor peace.

Strange Silence: Oregon's two Democratic Senators, Wayne Morse and Richard Neuberger, are normally talkative, even garrulous, individuals. Both champion the cause of labor unions on every occasion. Both have had the staunch support of the Teamsters Union in their successful Senate races.

All of which heightens the awed but bemused fascination of Capital observers at the stony silence on the part of both as regards the probe of Oregon racketeering involving Teamsters Union officials, as well as the eyebrow-raising financial practices of that union and its officers.

Morse-Neuberger comments to date, from the inception of the probe last year: a one-hour appearance by Neuberger on the Investigating Committee's witness stand, devoted primarily to extolling the merits of the city of Portland and its "ethical, responsible and law-abiding inhabitants"; a briefer eulogy by Morse to the same effect on the Senate floor.

Cloakroom question: Why the silence?

Economy and Taxes: The force of the anti-spending wave has brought in its wake, for the first time in this Congressional session, talk among legislators about reducing taxes. In January, it was the virtually unanimous opinion that no tax relief was possible this year. But now, significantly, it is the Democrats, the ruling party in Congress, who stir the speculation about tax cutting. Suggestions to date are that only excise and individual income taxes be reduced. But the notion of tax reduction is distinctly in circulation.

Claims by the leading "cutters" grow bolder, particularly this week, when the cuts from money bills in the House amounted to about 6½ percent of the total requested by the President. If that rate is sustained, about $4.6 billion dollars would be cut from the $71.8 billion Budget. Representative John Taber, chief GOP economizer in the House, expresses belief that the Budget can be cut to $65 billion, the ceiling which Representative Ray (R.-N.Y.) advocates in his rather popular resolution. And Senator Byrd raises his demand for reduction from $5 billion to $6.5 billion.

Mail from home demanding economy continues at a high level. "Liberal" commentators no longer contest this fact, but minimize it by claiming that such mail is not really for economy as such but merely against "foreign aid." This claim is denied by staffers who analyze the mail. They say that constituents mention the recommendations of the Hoover report more often than they do foreign aid. Thus waste seems to be the primary target of the protests from the grass roots.

Secretary George Humphrey has really polished off — it is felt here — the stock argument of the spenders, i.e., that because the population is growing and production is expanding, therefore the Government must correspondingly grow and cost more. In a speech in Detroit on March 6, the Secretary said: "As our economy produces more, it does not mean that the Government must spend more, continually increasing the paternalism of Government. Just the opposite is true. The more we have, the better able more of us should be to do for ourselves and be less and less dependent upon the Government."

Humphrey remains the hero, the only hero from the Executive arm, on Capitol Hill. The stock of Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks sagged badly this week as he defended the high Budget. Under the Dome it is remarked, "Sinnie is just trying to keep his job," referring to common talk that the White House would like to get Weeks to resign so as to replace him with Len Hall.

Federal Aid: With his unsuccessful blast at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (see HUMAN EVENTS for March 16) Health-Education-Welfare Secretary Marion B. Folsom exhausted his short supply of ammunition — such is Capital comment on the running battle over Federal aid to education. Federal aid enthusiasts, it is felt, suffered serious setbacks in the recently ended hearings of the Subcommittee on General Education. Subcommittee Chairman Cleveland M. Bailey (D.-W.Va.) remarked that "we're going to have to have a compromise to get a bill approved."

Many attribute this impasse to Folsom, who — it is remarked — "hung himself with his own statistics." With a complete monopoly of national school figures, Folsom was unable to piece together an "emergency" that could stand up under serious analysis. His difficulties are in turn attributed to the alertness of such groups as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and numerous others who gave devastating testimony against Federal aid.

Also instrumental in holding Federal aid advocates at bay has been Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn (R.-N.Y.), Subcommittee member and long-time foe of Big Government. Buried by the press but surveyed with keen interest by staffmen and legislators on the Hill was a speech Gwinn inserted in the *Congressional Record* last week. Gwinn showed that the "159,000 classroom shortage" is but the latest in a series of inaccurate — and constantly diminishing — "crisis" figures scraped together annually by Federal aid enthusiasts. Gwinn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noted that Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Folsom's predecessor at H.E.W., had offered three different estimates of the "shortage" — ranging from "over 300,000" on up — at various times in 1954 and 1955.

Then in March, 1955, Mrs. Hobby revealed that "we find a substantially different picture of classroom needs from the projections previously made on the basis of the 1951 survey . . . *We find that the estimated classroom deficit by the year 1959-60 would be 176,000 classrooms, rather than 407,000*" (an error in calculation of more than 100 per cent).

Now, Gwinn noted, Secretary Folsom caps these wobbling figures with his "159,000 classrooms emergency" — representing yet another reduction in the estimates forwarded by Mrs. Hobby. Because Folsom's estimate is based on a "quickie" survey of doubtful accuracy (see HUMAN EVENTS for February 23 and March 2), few in the Capital place much faith in it. But, it is said, assuming that any reliance at all can be placed in Folsom's statistics, they merely prove that the states have consistently outperformed every projection laid down by the education "experts."

Because of the unyielding opposition offered by such as Gwinn, the Chamber, and segments of the press — in conjunction with the groundswell for economy — feeling in the Capital is that the Federal Aid to Education bill might be defeated.

Book Event: *Death of a Navy*, by Andrieu d'Albas, Captain, French Navy; Devin-Adair; $5.50.

This book reviews the Pacific War (1941-45) from the perspective of the Japanese commanders. It discusses the great political decisions, as well as the battle-by-battle tactics, which affected the outcome of that struggle. We see Admiral Yamamoto, the naval chief, arguing against the attack on Pearl Harbor, but being overruled by a single vote; and Prime Minister Tojo, throughout the war anticipating a major Allied attack overland, rather than by sea or air, and thus severely hampering Japan's Navy. (Yet Japan came within a whisper of winning the sea war in its first year.)

Here are the facts of the fierce Army-Navy rivalry in Japan; the astounding story of the suicide-plane campaign and how it almost averted the final Allied victory; the vital role played by hara-kiri in Japan's defeat; the amazing night-battle supremacy of the Japanese Navy, whose sailors were trained to see at night.

The author of this important historical volume is a Japanese-speaking French Naval Officer, who is married to the daughter of a Japanese Admiral.

Book Review: *The Sovereign States*, by James Jackson Kilpatrick; Henry Regnery Co. $5.

By DONALD DAVIDSON

Noted literary critic and Professor of English at Vanderbilt University

The Sovereign States is a full, systematic, compelling statement of the dilemma in our Government — and our present conception of government — of which the segregation crisis in the Southern states is one painfully serious example.

With this book before the public it will no longer be possible, with any show of decency, to keep repeating the hypocritical claim that the "welfare state" is nothing more than a modern application of American "democratic" principles. The advocates of the welfare state are now cornered. Either they must acknowledge, openly, that they wish and intend to destroy the compact set forth in the Constitution, or else they must concede the sovereignty of the states, in the terms argued by Mr. Kilpatrick and the great witnesses, from Jefferson and Madison on down, that he summons into court. And they must further concede that the only real hope for the restoration of our guaranteed constitutional rights lies in resistance by the states to Federal usurpations and encroachments.

Mr. Kilpatrick's book is in the great tradition of American political thought. Its message is a message for every American who cherishes American liberty, for every state of North, South, East or West that is willing and ready, as all ought to be, to safeguard those political institutions that the States of the Union were founded to preserve and in fact are sworn to defend.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

Letter from Wm. M. TUCK, former Governor of Virginia, now Congressman from the Fifth District of that state: "I value your publication very highly, read it avidly, and use it frequently."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 12 HUMAN EVENTS March 23, 1957

Article Section

PRO-COMMUNISM IN AMERICAN COLLEGES
A Twelve-Point Program for Combatting It

By ANTHONY TRAWICK BOUSCAREN
Associate Professor of Political Science, Marquette University

LARGE NUMBERS of college professors in the United States have a double standard of political morality: fascism, they believe, is evil; but communism is something we must try to understand and get along with. In the 1930's there were faculty and student anti-fascist congresses, conventions, rallies, and demonstrations. The prevailing sentiment was a willingness to risk war to stop fascism; legislative investigations of the Bund were enthusiastically welcomed in liberal circles. But where are the faculty and student anti-Communist organizations and demonstrations today?

The plain fact is that they do not exist. Those who suggest a tougher policy against communism are denounced by liberal intellectuals as "warmongers"; those who welcome legislative investigation of communism are labelled "McCarthyites." Some scientists who bewailed the fact that the atomic targets in Japan were too small (among them J. Robert Oppenheimer) now demand the end of nuclear tests and oppose the use of such weapons in any war against communism. Those professors who supported or sympathized with Alger Hiss or Owen Lattimore were, and, in the latter case at least, are legion; those that favored Whittaker Chambers and the McCarran Committee are very few in number.

All of this constitutes a betrayal of America by its intellectuals. In the Popular Front of the 1930's, and in the Popular Front of today, the majority of these molders of youthful minds look upon communism and Communists as having something in common with democracy. To use George Meany's terminology, they look upon communism as a basically humanitarian ideology temporarily off the tracks. They are most sympathetic with what they call the "social experiments" in China and in Yugoslavia – but they throw up their hands in horror at the suggestion of sympathy and support of Korea and Formosa. As Max Ascoli has pointed out, the worst possible sin is membership in the "China Lobby."

Defense of Fifth Amendment invokers is taken as a matter of course; defense of those who help their Government expose the Communist conspiracy is anathema. Indeed, one such witness, Professor Herbert Fuchs of American University, was fired *because* he was anti-Communist, at the same time that M.I.T. restored Dirk Struik to its staff, and Harvard defended and retained its professors who invoked the Fifth Amendment. Needless to say, the American Association of University Professors is primarily, if not exclusively, interested in professors who invoke the Amendment or who have a background of Communist collaboration; anti-Communist professors who get into trouble are not the concern of the A.A.U.P.

COMMUNIST PENETRATION of American education is massive and takes many forms. First, there have been the actual Communist educational institutions themselves, such as the Jefferson School in New York and the California Labor School in San Francisco. Some of the professors from these Communist schools lecture on the campuses of leading American universities. Joseph Clark (foreign editor of the *Daily Worker*), Herbert Aptheker, Samuel Sillen and Alan Max are among those who have recently spoken at such institutions as Wisconsin, Minnesota, Swarthmore and Cornell. After a controversy in which he was barred from speaking at New York's municipal colleges, *Daily Worker* editor John Gates received an invitation to speak at Columbia University. Columbia officials, it was reported, granted the request to have Gates appear, "as a matter of course."

Second, there have been actual Communist units on college campuses, consisting both of faculty and students. Such units were the Labor Youth League, the Progressive Citizens of America, and the local and regional groups which were exposed by the House Un-American Activities Committee in Michigan and by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in New York several years ago. These groups brought Communist or pro-Communist speakers to the campus, agitated for the end of legislative investigations into communism, and demanded peace at any price with Soviet Russia and Communist China.

Third, there are those professors who refuse to deny under oath affiliations with communism. Among these have been Bernhard J. Stern of Columbia, Clarence Hiskey of Brooklyn Poly, Bernard Riess of Hunter College, Moses Finley and Saul Heimlich of Rutgers, and Gene Weltfish of Columbia. With respect to such professors, most schools follow Harvard's example of retaining such persons on the faculty. This is "academic freedom."

Fourth, we have that great host of professors who, over a long period of time, persistently affiliated with

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fellow-travelling organizations designated by the Attorney General or legislative committees as Communist-controlled. Among such have been Colston Warne of Amherst, Frederick L. Schuman of Williams, Kirtley Mather and Harlow Shapley of Harvard, Corliss Lamont of Columbia, Robert J. Havighurst of Chicago, Thomas I. Emerson of Yale, H. Hubert Wilson of Princeton, Robert S. Lynd of Columbia, Owen Lattimore of Johns Hopkins, and Edwin B. Burgum, New York. Not only do these men present a distorted, leftist point of view outside the classroom, but they write textbooks and reference books which are read by student and layman alike. Schuman's texts in international relations and the Soviet Union are still widely used in our colleges and universities today, and books by Lattimore, Lamont, Wilson, and Lynd have had, and in some instances continue to have, a wide following and influence.

Fifth, there is the vast majority of purveyors of the double standard of morality: the anti-anti-Communist professors. Although they may occasionally affiliate with an organization cited as subversive, their main stock in trade is to denounce anti-communism, and to give communism itself the benefit of the doubt in all cases. Most of these professors would agree with Paul Hoffman of the Fund for the Republic that America's greatest enemy today is not communism, but anti-communism. Among these might be included Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Harold Fisher of Stanford, Samuel Sharp of Harvard, Nathaniel Peffer of Columbia, and John K. Fairbank of Harvard. Their anti-anti-Communist message reaches thousands via the lecture platform, books, and through the services they render to Government, political leaders, publishers, and tax-exempt foundations. One of their standard bearers, Professor Francis Wormuth of Utah, recently praised the Wexley book about the Rosenberg atom spies in a leading political science journal, calling the Rosenberg trial "America's Dreyfus case."

Finally, the double standard moralists achieve their impact through myriad private organizations interested in American politics and world affairs. In the case of the Institute of Pacific Relations, its effective leadership, which consisted of Edward C. Carter, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Philip Jessup, and Owen Lattimore, profoundly influenced not only Governmental decisions relating to the Far East, but also teaching and research in colleges and universities, and the writing and publishing and book reviewing of volumes which were widely read and accepted even by the layman.

TODAY THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION and the Fund for the Republic carry on in the highest traditions of anti-anti-communism, subsidized by tax-exempt foundations, and inspired and guided by persons generally belonging to categories 4 and 5 outlined above. The Foreign Policy Association for years has been led by Vera Micheles Dean, who wrote in 1946: "If we are really honest with ourselves we cannot escape the conclusion that since V-J Day our economic withdrawal, our naked materialism as exemplified by our attitude toward the feeding of starving peoples, our political vacillations, and above all, our moral negativism, have done more to keep the world in turmoil than Russia's actions." This classic message of double standard morality reaches millions of thinking, adult Americans in most major cities of this land, organized into World Affairs Councils, as well as student groups on most of our college campuses, known as International Relations Clubs. Mrs. Dean and her cohorts have large sums of money to spend on guiding the thinking of such organizations along "correct" lines. The FPA organizes special seminars, mails thousands of kits containing bibliographical data and area studies to interested organizations, and sends speakers on tours throughout the United States. Among the current speakers on tour is John Carter Vincent, formerly head of the State Department's Far Eastern Division, who was found by the Civil Service Loyalty Board in 1952 to be of doubtful loyalty to the United States. Needless to say, there is no mention of this fact in the Foreign Policy Association speaker's bureau brochure.

The Fund for the Republic has given a cash prize to a pacifist group for not firing a Fifth Amendment employee; it has published a book attacking the security program without even trying to present the Government view; it has widely distributed a book on the Fifth Amendment which insists that we must not come to any conclusions when someone invokes the Amendment; it is subsidizing a project on American communism which is dominated by men who either have little or no background in this field, or who are double standard moralists; it offers cash prizes to anyone who can show to the satisfaction of the Fund that his civil liberties have been curtailed. Genuine anti-Communists receive no grants from this Fund, and such work as they do is done on slender budgets, or no budgets at all.

Confronted with this awesome spectacle of an American educational structure dominated by a doctrinaire, aggressive, intolerant, well-heeled and influential fraternity of double standard moralists, what can be done from the point of view of those who think aggression, slave labor, and subversion – under no matter whose auspices – is immoral, and should be eradicated? What are the genuine anti-Communists to do about this?

There are anti-Communists on our college faculties, and others who formerly so served. And although relatively few in number, they are intelligent and courageous people, capable of forming a hard core nucleus of anti-communism which is accomplishing much now on a small scale, and which potentially, on a large scale, can do immense good. No single list of anti-Communist professors can do justice to the fraternity as whole, but the following certainly qualify

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as members: Willmoore Kendall (Yale), David Rowe (Yale), Richard L. Walker (Yale), Gerhart Niemeyer (Notre Dame), Robert Strausz-Hupe (Pennsylvania), Robert T. Oliver (Penn State), Stefan Possony (Georgetown), Medford Evans (Northwestern of Louisiana), E. Merrill Root (Earlham), William McGovern (Northwestern), Kenneth Colegrove (Queens College), A. H. Hobbs (Pennsylvania), Sister Margaret Patricia McCarran (College of the Holy Names), Ludwig von Mises (New York University), Louis Budenz (Fordham), Godfrey P. Schmidt (Fordham), Charles Tansill (Georgetown), William Stokes (Wisconsin), Mark Graubard (Minnesota), Wladyslaw Kulski (Syracuse), Roman Smal-Stocki (Marquette), Robert J. Kerner (California), Felix Wittmer, James Burnham, William Henry Chamberlin, Alexander St. Ivanyi, F. A. Harper, Russell Kirk, Ruth Inglis, J. B. Matthews, and George Huszar. All of these are reaching many students and adults with their lectures and books.

Some of the smaller foundations have established annual seminars which encourage exchange of views among professors who can properly be described as anti-Communist; and some of these encourage publication. The small group of scholars at the University of Pennsylvania led by Professor Strausz-Hupe is doing an immense amount of good work with their Foreign Policy Research Institute; some of their publications have been reprinted in such influential media as *U.S. News and World Report* among others, and their radio programs, sympathetic to liberation, are excellent.

The small band of anti-Communist professors individually influence or seek to influence their non-Communist and even pro-Communist colleagues, as well as to train graduate students in the paths of consistency in the matter of totalitarianism. Although the task is difficult, these men do retain a foothold, however precarious, within the academic community. Their influence also reaches into Government to an increasing degree, particularly in the various war colleges operated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Scattered anti-Communist elements within Government give increasing recognition to these anti-Communists, and seek their services to a greater degree than previously. These men also reach the thinking public with articles in such widely read publications as the *Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest,* and *U.S. News,* as well as in the smaller journals such as *Human Events, National Review, American Mercury, National Republic,* and the newspapers that are associated with Spadea Syndicate. *Human Events,* with its weekly Washington commentary and staunchly conservative feature articles, has eclipsed the circulation figures of the two leading left-wing journals, *The Nation* and *The New Republic. National Review,* with its excellent editorial staff (Buckley, Bozell, Burnham, Schlamm, Mitchell, LaFollette, etc.), is challenging the left-wing intellectuals at their own game with conspicuous success.

FIVE COLLEGES in the United States now present comprehensive and critical courses devoted exclusively to the theory and practice of communism. These are Marquette, Duquesne, Georgetown, Fordham, and the University of San Francisco; in the latter school, the course, initiated by the militantly anti-Communist Jesuit Father Raymond Feely, S.J., is compulsory for all seniors. In some of these schools and in scattered others, pilot anti-Communist leadership training programs for adults have been started. The idea is to meet with and train community leaders and potential leaders: they are acquainted with Communist literature, notably the *Daily Worker,* as well as with leading anti-Communist books and periodicals, and Government publications. At the end of the course each graduate is urged to spread the gospel himself, by bringing the anti-Communist message to others, familiarizing them with anti-Communist publications, and by converting non-Communists into anti-Communists.

It is clear from the above brief resumé that some start, however modest, has already been made by the anti-Communist fraternity in our colleges and universities. But beyond this, what else could be done to strengthen anti-communism in the academic realm? Here is a twelve-point outline to suggest a program of action:

1) Anti-communism can be strengthened by encouraging promising young men and women to join the anti-Communist academic fraternity. Anti-Communist professors should increase their efforts to win over their best students not only to anti-communism but also to careers in the movement to defeat the Communist conspiracy. Such students should be encouraged to do graduate work at those universities where consistency in the matter of totalitarianism is at least tolerated, and under those professors whose records indicate stability and consistency with respect to the same matter. Young men and women armed with advance degrees are in a position not only to teach, write, and do research, but they are also better equipped to obtain positions in Government, where the anti-Communist intellectual today is a very scarce commodity indeed.

2) Students who do not plan to do graduate work, and who do not contemplate careers in teaching, writing, research, or Government, should be encouraged to make their anti-Communist influence felt in the legal profession, in politics directly, and in industry. Here again, the sympathetic professor and parent can play a decisive role.

3) Anti-Communist professors, graduate students, and college seniors should be more aggressive with respect to applying for the numerous grants, fellowships and scholarships offered by myriad foundations, Government, and universities. As it is, the applicants tend overwhelmingly to be double standard moralists.

4) Programs such as the Conference on Democratic Theory (Professor Stokes of Wisconsin) and the For-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia (Professor Strausz-Hupe) should be strengthened and multiplied. It is here where professors who were not led astray by the siren song of Moscow can become acquainted, exchange ideas, develop anti-Communist projects and publications, make better contacts with Government, and pave the way for united and national anti-Communist action on the academic level. The less well-known foundations have already done much good work, and with the help of industry and certain discerning colleges, much more can be accomplished.

5) Anti-Communist professors should strive to have incorporated into the curricula of their respective colleges courses on the theory and practice of communism, to be taught by themselves or some other qualified person. They should also develop anti-Communist leadership training programs for adult groups such as that established by the Department of Political Science at Marquette University in Milwaukee.

6) Existing courses in American Government should be strengthened, and introduced where they are not now compulsory. The Defense Department's Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War reported in 1955: "Many of the P.O.W.s knew too little about the United States and its ideals and traditions. The uninformed P.O.W.s were up against it. They couldn't answer arguments in favor of communism with arguments in favor of Americanism. . . . They lacked sufficient patriotism because of their limited knowledge of democracy." Courses should be revised with respect to content and required reading to take this criticism into consideration.

7) These professors should improve their contacts with Government and private organizations interested in effective counteraction against Communist aggression and subversion. Much good can result from improving such contacts — to all concerned. Such organizations as the Commission on Government Security (Loyd Wright), the Foundation for American Research (also in Washington), the Committee of One Million Against Admission of Communist China to the UN, the Foreign Policy Research Institute, the Conference on Democratic Theory, seminars on communism organized by patriotic groups, those foundations and industrial organizations which are inclined to give equal opportunity to anti-communism, and legislative committees both on the Federal and state levels should know who the anti-Communist professors are, and vice-versa.

8) Anti-Communist professors should offer their services to the communism study project in Washington headed by Charles Lowry and William Yandell Elliott. This group is studying ways and means of introducing critical courses in communism into our high schools and colleges. If properly handled, this project gives promise of accomplishing much good.

9) Greater use of the techniques of joint letters to the editors of the *New York Times*, to the President, and to the Secretary of State, with appropriate publicity, should be made. Professors of other persuasions constantly utilize these stratagems to great effect. The current situation in Hungary cries for leadership among anti-Communist academicians.

10) Serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a high-level academic journal friendly to anti-communism which might have an influence comparable to existing "neutralist" journals.

11) Anti-Communist professors can do more to focus attention on the crucial issues of our day by stressing the urgency of the problem and the need for action now: Since the Third World War began in 1944 with the Communist invasion of Greece, 800 million human beings have come under Communist control, as have 8 million square miles of territory. If the rate of expansion in the future continues to hold the pattern of the past 12 years, the international Communist movement will control the world by 1970 (assuming no United States-led counterattack).

12) These professors should exploit the dramatic events in Hungary to the utmost, and energetically warn their audiences of the deception of Communist "peace offensives" and "new looks." Wide circulation should be given the following Government publications: *Communism, USA* (Senate Internal Security Subcommittee), *Soviet Total War* (House Un-American Activities Committee), and *The Great Pretense* (same committee). Additionally, wide circulation and support of such publications as *Human Events, U.S. News and World Report, National Review, Counterattack,* and other intelligent anti-Communist periodicals should be encouraged.

Such opportunities for anti-communism as exist in the academic world must be taken advantage of — now. The mistakes, inconsistencies, and, in some cases, the collaboration with communism of the other fraternity need to be exposed mercilessly by others than legislative committees. If nothing else, the vigor and sustained effort of the liberal intellectuals should arouse anti-Communist academicians into launching that counterattack which, if coordinated with similar movements elsewhere (including that of the Hungarian patriots), will lead inevitably to the eventual eradication of communism from the world body politic.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED